
Armenia in the Agonies of National Crucifixion

Author(s): Garabed M. Missirian

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Jan., 1916), pp. 324-338

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738148>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:14 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

ARMENIA IN THE AGONIES OF NATIONAL CRUCIFIXION

By Garabed M. Missirian, M.A.

To serve Armenia is to serve civilization.—*W. E. Gladstone.*

It is only during the last twenty-five years that Armenia and the Armenians have been brought before the attention of the world, mainly through those tragical events which have shocked the conscience of civilized humanity.

The horror of the Armenian massacres has naturally aroused the sympathy and indignation of all the champions of justice and liberty. America, as well as Europe, has heard and responded, largely through the kindness of the American Board of Foreign Missions, to a certain degree; individual sympathy and help have been given in the past as well as at the present time. The great interest and generous spirit recently of the "American Committee on the Armenian Atrocities," in particular that of Dr. James L. Barton, deserve the appreciation of all noble natures. This widespread sympathy for the victims of Turkish oppression, however sincere, has been of a temporary character because of the lack of real knowledge as to the history, religion, literature and character of the Armenians. Though several members of the friends of the Armenian nation have written books and articles and so provided general information about the Armenians, unfortunately, with a few exceptions, the presentation of the facts has not been altogether just and thorough. So I have attempted to present a concise and brief account along the above mentioned lines, hoping that knowledge will appeal to reason and reason will lead to action and lasting friendship.

I

The Armenians fall under the same category as the inhabitants of India and Persia who form the Aryans of Asia. The Armenian language proves this by its affinity with the Indo-European tongues. Their physiognomy and physical constitution connect them with the Caucasian stock. Their manners and customs as well as their religious beliefs, in heathenism, were similar to those of the Assyrians and Chaldeans, of the Medes and Persians, and still later, of the Parthians.

The Armenians called themselves Haik, after Haig, the most celebrated of their ancient kings and their land Haiasdan "the house of Haig." Their national legends, fortified, in their eyes by the Bible, make Haig descend from Ashkenaz or Togarmah, children of Gomer, a patriarch of the line of Japhet (Gen. x.2.3).

In the old Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions we find, as early as 1100 B.C. Armenia under the names, Kingdom of Urartu, land of Nairi, Kummukh (Comagene) and Khani or Khanigalbat. Tiglathpileser I, Assuruazoipal, Salmaneser II and III, Sargon and other Assyrian and Babylonian kings waged long and important campaigns upon the above mentioned lands, which were the pro-Armenian states.

The earliest biblical mention of this land is in Gen. viii. 4, where we are told that the ark of Noah "rested upon the mountains of Ararat," a term which evidently refers to a district. Another scriptural allusion is in connection with Sennacherib, whose parricidal sons are said to have escaped 681 B.C., "into the land of Armenia" (Heb. Ararat) (2 Kings xix. 37; Isa. xxxvii. 38). Ezekiel also refers to Armenia under the name Togarmah, as furnishing Tyre with horses and mules, a product for which it is still noted, (Ezek. xxvii. 14, also xxxviii. 6). Tigranes I is said to have been an ally of Cyrus the Great in overthrowing the Babylonians, and thus in liberating the Jews after their seventy years' captivity, 538 B.C. A foreshadowing of this event is probably found in the prophet Jeremiah: "Call together against her the Kingdoms of Ararat, Minni

and Ashkenaz—to make the land of Babylon a desolation without an inhabitant” (Jer. Li. 27–29; also L. 9, 41–42). The name Minni here suggests that the etymology of Armenia may possibly be har-Minni, the mountains of Minni.

In the famous inscriptions of the Achemenidae, at Persepolis and at Besistan, the name Armenia is found in various forms, and the Armenian Tributaries march after the Cappadocians to render homage to the Great King (Christian Lassen, *Die Altpersischen Keil-Inschriften von Persepolis*. Bonn. 1836, pp. 86–87).

Herodotus mentions the absorption of the Armenian empire in that of Darius, 514 B.C., and a tribute of four hundred talents exacted (Bk. III, Ch. 93). In its widest extent, Armenia stretched from the Caucasus to Mesopotamia and from Pontus and Cappadocia to the Caspian Sea. This vast territory consists of plateaus from five thousand to eight thousand feet high, broken by lofty mountains and fertile valleys. Here lie Lake Van, the ancient Arsissa Palus, and Lake Urumiah; the former with an area of 1500, and the latter with an area of 1600 square miles, both of them salt, with no outlet, and over 5000 feet above the sea. Here four great rivers have their source; the Kur and Aras flowing through one mouth into the Caspian Sea, while the Tigris and Euphrates pour their mingled waters into the Persian Gulf. The Euphrates divides the country into what was known by the ancients as Armenia Major to the east, and Armenia Minor to the west. Here Mount Ararat, the boundary stone of three empires, towers up 17,000 feet, till from his hoary head the sky looks green (Prof. Bryce, *Trans-Caucasia and Ararat*).

Besides the Babylonian, Assyrian, and old Persian campaigns, Armenia was included in the conquest of Alexander and afterwards submitted to the Seleucidae of Syria. In 190 B.C. when Antiochus the Great was defeated by Scipio, Armenia revolted under Artaxias, who gave refuge to the exiled Hannibal. About 150 B.C. the great Parthian King, Mithridates I, established his brother Valarsaces in Armenia. The most celebrated king of this branch of the Arsacid family was Tigranes II, who, while aiding

Mithridates of Pontus, was defeated by Pompey. After this, Tacitus says that the Armenians were almost always at war; with the Romans through hatred, and with the Parthians through jealousy (*Annales*, Bk. II, Ch. 56). Princes of this line continued to rule, however, until the Arsacidae were driven from the Persian throne by the Sassanid Ardashir. Though frequently conquered by the kings of that dynasty, Armenia was enabled often to reassert her freedom by the help of Roman arms.

When Tiridates embraced Christianity, 276 A.D., the struggle became embittered by the introduction of a religious element for the Persians were bigoted Zoroastrians. This condition reached a climax when the country was divided between the Romans and Persians, under Theodosius the Great 390 A.D.

After the fall of the Sassanidae, in the seventh century, Armenia was divided between the Greek empire and the Saracens; but from 859 to 1045 A.D. it was again ruled by a native dynasty of vigorous princes, the Paganidae. This was brought to a close by the suspicious and short-sighted policy of the Byzantine emperors, who annexed this province, thereby laying open their whole eastern frontier to the invasion of the Seljuk Turks, who shortly before had begun their attacks, and who might have been successfully resisted by these hardy mountaineers. The result was fatal, both to Armenia, which was overrun, and to the Greek empire; for by the battle of Manzikert, 1071 A.D., when Romanus IV was defeated and made prisoner by Alp Arslan, the whole of Asia Minor was left at the mercy of the Seljuks.

Ruben, however, a relative of the last Paganid sovereign, escaped into Cilicia, and established the Rupinian principality there which was not extinguished until the death of Leon VI, 1393, an exile in Paris, and the last of the Armenian kings. The Rupinians had entered into an alliance with the Crusaders. They welcomed the Mongolian hordes under Genghis Khan, early in the thirteenth century, and suffered the vengeance of the Mamelukes, 1375, when Armenia ceased to be a separate kingdom until the present time.

At the beginning of the European war the Armenians numbered about 3,000,000, of whom 1,500,000 were under the sultan, 1,000,000 in Russia, 200,000 in Persia, 100,000 in America, and the rest widely scattered in Europe and Egypt.

II

The Armenian Church is the oldest of all the national churches of the East. Their legends claim that our Lord corresponded with King Abgarus of Edessa and that the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholemew preached the gospel to them. But the historical founder of the Armenian Church was St. Gregory "The Illuminator," an Arsacid prince, related to Tiridates, who was consecrated bishop of Armenia, at Caesarea in 302 A.D. The Armenian Church is Episcopal in polity, and closely resembles the Greek in outward forms.

Misled by imperfect reports of the Council of Chalcedon, which they were not able to attend on account of Persian persecutions, the Armenian bishops annulled its decrees in 491, thus gaining the credit of being Eutychians, which led to their gradual separation from the orthodox church. This antagonism was doubtless political as much as doctrinal, on account of the attempts at ecclesiastical supremacy by the churches of Constantinople and Rome. A second schism was brought about in the sixteenth century by Jesuit missionaries, who succeeded in detaching the community of Catholic or united Armenians from the Mother Church, of which the Catholicos, at Etchmiadzin, is recognized by all others as the supreme head.

The hopefulness of reformation in the Armenian Church is increased by three facts; first, the Armenian Church is in bondage to no human 'infallible' authority; second, their errors of doctrine and practice have not been sanctioned by councils; third, they acknowledge the supreme authority of the Bible, which, being now translated into the modern tongue, is no longer a sealed book.

As to language and literature, the Armenian grammar is analogous to that of other languages of the same origin, and is not inferior to them in its resources. It has lost,

to be sure, the distinction of gender, hut the declensions and conjugations compare well with the Latin. The accent is on the last syllable, and many of the strong consonantal sounds strike the ear of a foreigner with harshness. The rich native vocabulary has been increased by additions from the many languages with which it has come in contact. We find here, as in the German, great facility in building compound words.

The earliest specimen of this language, though in the cuneiform character, is probably to be found in the trilingual inscriptions on the great citadel rock of Van, which have not yet been satisfactorily made out. The pre-Christian literature of Armenia, consisting of national songs, has entirely perished, except a few quotations. All that has come down to us is subsequent to the fourth century, and refers exclusively to history or religion. Poetry and fiction never flourished among this serious nation, always in the midst of danger or suffering.

The Armenian version of the Bible, made by Mesrob, the inventor of their alphabet, and his disciples, early in the fifth century, has been called the queen of versions for its beauty, and is of some critical value in determining the readings of the Septuagint, of which it does not follow any known recension. Hundreds of other translations from Syriac and Greek writers soon followed, some of which are extant only in Armenian.

The fifth century, their Golden Age, was adorned by such classic writers as Yeznig of Goghpa, who wrote most eloquently, in four books, against the Persian fire worshippers, the Greek philosophers, the Marcion heresy, and the Manicheans; Goriun, the biographer of Mesrob; David, the philosopher and translator of Aristotle; Yeghishi, who relates the heroic struggle of Vartan for the Christian faith against Persia; Lazarus of Parb; and Moses of Khorene, their national historian. There follows a period of four centuries of literary barrenness, due to political disorder and schism.

Under the Rupinian dynasty there was a second period of literary brilliancy. Then flourished Nerses Schnorhali

"The Graceful," an orator grafted upon the poet, as well as Nerses of Lampron whose hymns also enrich the beautiful Armenian liturgy. The Annals of Matthew of Edessa give interesting facts about the first crusade. Samuel of Ani, John Vanagan, Vartan the Great, and Thomas of Medzoph wrote succeeding chronicles. A third revival of Armenian letters was begun by Mechitar of Sebastia (Sivas) who established an order of Catholic monks at the Monastery of St. Lazarus in Venice, 1717. These fathers have won the interest and admiration of European scholars by their publication of Armenian classics, together with many learned original contributions. Other centers of literary activity are the Mechitarists of Vienna, the College Monrad in Paris, and the Institute of Moscow, as well as the schools of Constantinople and Tiflis.

In the study of the Armenian language and literature, the most valuable work done in Europe has been that of such men as Saint Martin, Dulaurier, Langlois, Bore, and Prudhomme in France; Malan and Congheare in England; Neve in Holland; Emin, Patcanian and Brosset and Rapphi in Russia; and Windischmann, Marle, Spiegel, Neumann and Petermann in Germany.

III

After the capture of Constantinople, in 1453, Mohammed II, the greatest ruler of the Ottoman Empire, organized his non-Moslem subjects in communities, under ecclesiastical chiefs to whom he gave reasonable authority in civil and religious matters. Under this system the Armenian bishop of Brusa was called to Constantinople by the Sultan, becoming practically the head of the community, and a recognized officer of the Imperial Government with the rank of Vizier. This secured for the Armenians, though for a very short period, a respectable position before the law, the free enjoyment of their religion, the possession of their own churches and monasteries, and the right to manage their municipal affairs. Thus the Armenians became gradually prominent in affairs of state, in particular as ministers of finance and commerce.

With the treaty of Kuchuk Kainarja in 1774, which marked the definite establishment of Russia as a Black Sea power, the Eastern Question was born, which gave to the former a basis for special claims to interfere in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. The compact between Napoleon and the Emperor Alexander I of Russia at Tilsit, in 1807, marked a new phase which culminated in 1812 in the treaty of Bucharest, in which Russia definitely appeared as the protector of the Christian nationalities subject to the Turkish government.

Russia began to interest herself in the Armenians when she acquired Georgia in 1801. But it was not until 1829 that a considerable number of Armenians—over one million—became her subjects. She found them necessary for the development of her new territories, and allowed them much freedom. So many became wealthy, and many rose to high positions in the military and civil service of the state. After the war of 1877–1878, the Russian consuls in Turkey encouraged the formation of patriotic committees in Armenia and a project was formed to create a separate state, under the supremacy of Russia, which was to include Russian, Turkish and Persian Armenia. But this plan failed by the assassination of the Czar Alexander II, in 1881. And afterwards a strong anti-Armenian policy was adopted. Attempts were made to russify the Armenians and bring them under the pale of the Russian Church.

In Turkish Armenia, when Abdul Hamid came to the throne of Turkey in 1876, the condition of the Armenians was comparatively good. But with the close of the war, 1878, came more definitely the "Armenian Question." By the treaty of San Stephano, Turkey had engaged Russia to carry out reforms in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians and to guarantee their security against the Kurds and Circassians—professional robbers and highwaymen. However, by the treaty of Berlin, 13th of July, 1878, in the sixty-first article, a like engagement to the six signatory powers was substituted for that to Russia. In the same year the Sultan of Turkey promised Great Britain to introduce necessary re-

forms for the protection of the Christians and other subjects of the Porte in the Turkish territories in Asia. But it came to pass that the sultan, realizing that Powers were in balance, and that they could not do or command anything with unity, took the policy of promising and not doing. And since then that article of the Treaty of Berlin has been a dead letter. The situation of the Armenians grew worse after the Congress of Berlin. Furious at their audacity in demanding reforms, the Turkish government increased its persecution, officially encouraged the Kurds to kill and pillage their Armenian neighbors, and multiplied the obstacles in the way of the moral and material development of the Armenian people. Consequently the idea of defending the rights of the Armenian people by revolutionary means was born and developed in the minds of the younger generation of Armenians who were inspired by the principles of European civilization. Secret committees were formed, and the people were urged to oppose their persecutors by armed resistance. Bloody collisions in different places—Erzerum, Marsovan, Sivas and finally Sasun—took place between the Turks or Kurds and the Armenians. At Constantinople some hundreds of Armenian patriots appeared before the Sublime Porte to demand the immediate execution of the reform projects which Europe had proposed to the sultan after the massacre of Sasun. The sultan, however, replied to the propositions of Europe and to the demands of the Armenians by extending the application of systematic massacre to all parts of Armenia.

Under Turkish rule, massacres of Christians have become chronic. Besides the outrages in Macedonia and a multitude of lesser slaughters, there have been, since 1820, seven massacres on a vast scale. They are not accidental explosions of fanaticism, but the systematic carrying out of a preconceived plan. Even after the constitutional government was established in 1908, the young Turk party, in spite of their obligations to numerous Armenian advisors, has proclaimed repeatedly and followed the motto—"Turkey for the Turks."

In 1822, a Turkish army fell upon peaceful and unarmed

Chios, murdered 23,000 Greek Christians, and sold 47,000 into slavery. In 1850 in Kurdistan, 10,000 Nestorians and Armenians were massacred. In 1867, in Crete, the blood of Christian women and children flowed like water. In 1876, 10,000 persons perished during the Bulgarian atrocities. It is interesting to remember that these were first made known by the American consul, Eugene Schuyler, whose report on the subject aroused the noble spirit of Mr. Gladstone, and led to an agitation that stirred all Europe.

Next came the great Armenian massacres of 1894-95-96, beginning at Sassoon and carried out systematically through the principal cities of the Empire, including Constantinople. At that time 300,000 men, women and children lost their lives with unimaginable cruelties. In the spring of 1909 another fatal blow came upon the nation, with the Cilician massacres, in which over 100,000 persons were recklessly destroyed.

And now, at the present time, history is repeating itself. But it is the most horrible and fatal massacre that the Armenians have ever been subjected to in Turkey. As it was reported through the American Committee on Armenian Atrocities and in the daily papers and weekly and monthly magazines, over 700,000 people are exiled from their homes to the Arabian desert, without food and shelter, most of them being slaughtered; women and children are outraged and even the aged people are not spared.

And this devilish policy has been going on since the beginning of last spring, and no government or nation has ever attempted to *stop* it. The protest of the United States, through her noble ambassador,—the man of the hour—has been unfortunately disregarded. In spite of the most generous spirit of the American character for the relief work, and the most sincere and self-sacrificing attitude of the American Committee on Armenian Atrocities, the whole of Armenia with all its population has been left in subjection to the destructive policy of the Turkish government allied with German genius, on the one hand, and to helpless western civilization on the other.

The Armenians, however, are not "rebellious, rotten and bloodthirsty" people, to be given over to extermination. I am not a Chauvinist. The love that I bear to my race is not made up of a blind and fanatical admiration. I know that our people are not free from faults, yet I do not believe it is fair or just to see only the filthiness of a man shut up in a fetid dungeon. The heart of such a man must be considered, and the heart of the Armenian people has remained sound and healthy.

The only reason for my devotion to my race is that I consider it an element of life, as a force in civilization.

IV

The modern world is still grateful to the Greek for having victoriously resisted the invasion of the Persians, for having delivered Europe from the domination of the Asiatic. But in this task the Armenian was to the Greek a constant and important auxiliary. The history of Armenia is only the story of a continual resistance to the movement of Asia toward Europe. Before embracing Christianity the Armenian was not yet precisely conscious of his rôle. He thought only of defending his native land against the enemies of the Orient as against those of the Occident, against the Persians as against the Romans. It is true that already the spirit of the race was turned towards the Occident. It was the Greek that drew it. Tigranes the Great, the ally of Mithridates, caused numerous statues of Greek divinities to be brought from Athens to enrich the Armenian temples, and invited rhetoricians, musicians, and dramatic troupes in order to acclimate Attic art in his capitol at Tigranocerta. But it was especially after the adoption of Christianity that the Armenian people definitely allied themselves with the Occidental world. Directly on the route, as they were, of all Asiatic invasions, they received the first shock, and by a resistance as obstinate as destructive, embarrassed and often delayed the march towards Europe. Armenia struggled for two centuries against the Great Persian Sassanids, who wished to crush and assimilate it, but who did not succeed. It fought

against the Arabs, the Turcomans, the Tartars, the Mamelukes, the Turks. It fought to defend its national existence and, at the same time, the occidental ideas with which it was impregnated and which perilously isolated it in the midst of these great sanguinary races. It constituted the advance guard of European civilization in the East.

The Crusaders in their struggles against Islam found a spontaneous and enthusiastic assistance in the princes of Armenia Minor, who provided them with troops and provisions. Pope Gregory XIII says of the Armenians in his bull "*Ecclesia Romana*" of the year 1384:

Among the other merits of this Armenian nation toward the Church and the Christian Republic, this in particular is eminent and worthy of special remembrance, that when formerly the princes and the Christian armies were on their way to the Holy Land, no nation and no people more promptly and with more zeal than the Armenians rendered them its aid in men, in horses, in arms, in food, in counsel: in a word with all their strength, with the greatest fervour and fidelity, the Armenians aided the Europeans in these Holy Wars.

It was on account of this attachment to Occidental civilization that the Armenian people ended by losing their own independence. The Kingdom of Armenia Minor in Cilicia formed a sort of prolongation of Europe into the Orient. Its ports were in constant intercourse with Venice, Genoa, Marseilles. The Mamelukes and the Turks, furious at seeing in their neighborhood this nucleus of European civilization, redoubled their attacks and succeeded at the end of the fourteenth century in destroying this ancient little Kingdom of Armenia, which was crushed only after two centuries of desperate conflicts, and which received no assistance from Europe in this final and supreme crisis.

To all these services rendered Europe by the rôle which the Armenian has played in his own country, we must add those which have come from the important part which he has directly taken in Occidental civilization through the illustrious men which Armenia has furnished to European civilization. Nerses, the heroic captain who rendered invincible the armies of Justinian, was of Armenian origin, and it was to an Armenian, Proeresius, the greatest rhetori-

cian of Athens in the fourth century, that Rome erected a statue with the following inscription, "Regina rerum Roma regi eloquentiae." The Armenian formed one of the essential elements of the Byzantine Empire. "Some of the most remarkable men of the war of Byzantine, the Lecapeni, as well as Mleh, true national hero, founder of the Theme of 'Lykandos,' are of Armenian origin, and the throne of the Lower Empire has been occupied by ten Armenian emperors, of which Leo V, Basil II, and especially John Zimiskes, are among the greatest figures of Byzantine history." Herr Gelzer, the German Byzantine savant, thinks that the period of the Armenian emperors was the most glorious in the history of the Lower Empire.

In modern times, the Armenian has continued to play the same rôle in Poland, in Hungary, in Russia and in Egypt. The Armenian emigrants who established themselves in Poland after the fall of the dynasty of the Pagaritidae of Armenia (in the eleventh century) have given to that country poets, artists, diplomatists, and military men of the first rank. In 1410 all the Armenian nobility fought with the armies of Ladislar Jagello, and in the battle of Grunwaldt contributed to the victory. In 1683, in the great war of the Austrians against the Turks, 5000 Armenian soldiers fought valiantly with King Sobieski, at the gates of Vienna against the Turks. Russia was able to crush the Persian and the Turk only when advised by Armenian diplomats like Israel Ori, and by the assistance of generals of Armenian origin—Madatoff, Loris—Melikoff and others. It was an Armenian, Nubar Pasha, who by diplomatic skill was able without war to withdraw Egypt from the Turkish yoke, and to introduce there a European administration, which has regenerated that country.

At the present time, in the Caucasus and in Persia and Turkey, in spite of very unfavorable conditions, Armenians have constituted one of the most important commercial elements. The fine stuffs, the embroideries, the tapestry, the jewelry which are admired in Europe and in America as Turkish products are almost exclusively made by Armenians. The architectural beauties of Constanti-

nople are due in great part to Armenian genius. The marvelous mosque of Suleiman—the Ottoman San Sophia—is the work of the architect, Sinan, of Armenian origin; and Armenian architects, the Balian, constructed the palaces of Tcheragon, of Begler-beg, of Yildiz-Keoshk, and that of Dolma-bakcheh, “which might be taken,” says Theophile Gautier, “for a Venetian palace,—only richer, vaster, and more highly ornamented—transported from the Grand Canal to the banks of the Bosphorus.”

I may now say a word in regard to Armenian character as a nation, because it has a very decided, a very original one. Unfortunately most of the Western writers on Armenia and Armenians have not succeeded in bringing out this most essential and vital element. If the Greek is characterized by his intelligence, by his worship of plastic beauty, and by his dream of an harmonious and noble life, the Armenian is characterized by an indestructible tenacity of faith in himself, by an open attachment to his traditions and national beliefs, and by the worship of a simple and laborious life. The family among the Armenians has preserved the rigid purity and the pious discipline of ancient patriarchal conditions. Lord Byron says:

This oppressed nation has partaken of the prescription and bondage of the Jews and of the Greeks, without the sullenness of the former or the servility of the latter. It would be hard perhaps to find the annals of a nation less stained with crimes than those of the Armenians, whose virtues have been those of peace and their vices those of compulsion.

The Armenian Church is perhaps that one among all others which has best preserved its national vitality. It has its own alphabet and calendar. This powerful attachment to itself, however, has not prevented the Armenian people from showing an open spirit to all the progress of the Occidental world, and a promptness to assimilate it. Only fifty years after the discovery of Gutenberg, Armenian emigrants, established at Venice and Amsterdam, made use of this invention by constructing some Armenian characters and printing some manuscripts of the old Armenian authors—a translation of the Gospel, Mystic Meditations,

Chronicles, Treatises on Magic, etc. It is by following the example of the Armenians that the Turks have a press and a theater. The founder of young Turkey, Midhat Pasha, had for his advisers the Armenians, Odian and Servicen. Is it not tragic and unbearable to notice that it is by the name and initiative of the young Turks that at the present time the horrible policy to exterminate the Armenian race is carried out? This seems the culmination of the appreciation of the Turkish government of the ever suffering nation who has served and ministered so faithfully. Here the whole nation is in the agonies of crucifixion. Nearly 800,000 have been driven out of their homes to desolate places, without shelter and without food. Many have been slaughtered, even the women and children have been outraged. Why? Because they are Armenians, because they have pursued higher ideals and aspirations and have kept their faith to the end. Shall the civilized world and the Christian members of the Kingdom of God allow the continuance of these endless sufferings? The European Powers are hardly able to carry out their plans in the great war, and the neutral powers are confessing their inability to save this nation. Armenia has been left helpless. Yet she has not ceased to raise her voice, demanding *justice* and *humanity*. These she desires to obtain in order to take up once more her task as a good laborer, and a valiant soldier in the cause of civilization.